

REMARKS

I. Status of Claims:

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims pending in the application are requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-29, 32-27, 39, 41 and 43-45 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-3, 5-29, 32-27, 39, 41 and 43-45 have been rejected.

Claims 8, 11, 12, 16, 13, 21, 22, 24, 25, 33, and 45 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-3, 5-29, 32-27, 39, 41 and 43-45 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication US 2003/0036350 A1 to Jonsson et al.

Claims 1, 8, 33 and 45 have been amended to further define the claimed subject matter with respect to the cited art. New Claims 46-49 have been added to obtain further protection for the invention.

Before responding to the rejection, Applicants would like to distinguish Jonsson from the claimed subject matter, as follows:

A. Jonsson discloses a method for selecting a device for a service connection with an initiating device comprising the steps of: transmitting an inquiry message requesting a response from devices which receive said inquiry message that are within a desired class; identifying proximate devices within said desired class based on responses to said inquiry message; querying said identified

devices to obtain at least one attribute value associated with a particular service; comparing, for each said identified device, said at least one attribute value with a profile associated with said particular service; and selecting one of said identified devices based on said comparing step. Jonsson fails to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter, as follows:

1. Jonsson fails to disclose personal profiles in a wireless terminal for sharing with others in an ad hoc network

Jonsson at Paragraph 4 discloses a terminal in an ad hoc network sending a SDP request specifying a service that it is seeking. In contrast, applicants at page 3, lines 16-22 generating personal profiles at a wireless terminal in an ad hoc network for sharing with other users in the network. Jonsson fails to disclose personal profiles or sharing profiles with other users in an ad hoc network.

2. Jonsson fails to disclose storing personal profiles in SDP records.

Jonsson at Paragraph 0035 discloses sending a standard SDP requests including attributes of a service. In contrast, applicants at page 5, lines 17-19 discloses personal profiles are stored in SDP records in a standardized format. Jonsson fails to disclose storing personal profiles in SDP records.

3. **Jonsson fails to disclose determining if a user profile and an inquiring user's profile have a second level of close matching, which is closer than a first level.**

Jonsson at Paragraph 35 discloses determining how well the responding Bluetooth device's attributes match the initiator's service profile. If the responding device is identified as a candidate by matching profiles, then the responding device will be inserted into a candidate list. In contrast, applicants at page 28, lines 3-12 discloses determining that two user profiles compare sufficiently at a first level of matching to justify expressing an interest in obtaining more information about the profile of the inquiring device. In response to a second level of matching the profile response "I'm interested", sent by the user's terminal, the inquiring device prepares to send personal information. Jonsson fails to disclose second level matching and sending information to the inquiring device in response to the second level matching.

Summarizing, Jonsson fails to disclose or suggest (i) personal profile generation and management in a short-range wireless terminal for sharing profiles in a short range wireless communication network; (ii) storing personal profiles in SDP records, and (iii) performing second level matching of profiles for providing detailed private information to an inquiring device.

The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-29, 32-37, 39, 41, and 43-45 under 35 USC 102 (e) is without support in the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the rejected claims are requested.

Now turning to the rejection, Applicants respond to the rejections of the subject Office Action, as follows:

I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112, second paragraph:

A. Claim 8:

Claim 8 has been amended to define where the message is from and who is doing the filtering of the incoming message. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 is requested

B. Claims 11, 12 and 16:

The term “phone book section” is described in the specification at page 6, lines 20-21. The amendment of claims 11, 12 and 18 is not believed necessary. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11, 12 and 16 is requested.

C. Claim 12:

The term “generic information” is described in the specification at page 6, lines 20-21. The amendment of claim 12 is not believed necessary. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12 is requested

D. Claims 11 and 13:

The term “detailed personal information” is described in the specification at page 6, lines 21-22. The amendment of claims 11 and 13 is not believed necessary. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 13 is requested.

E. Claims 21, 22, 24, 25, 33 and 45:

The term “more detailed private information” is described in the specification at page 29, lines 10-17. The amendment of claims 21, 22, 24, 25, 33 and 45 is not believed necessary. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21, 22, 24, 25, 33 and 45 is requested.

F. Claims 32 and 41:

The term “predefined tolerance” is described in the specification at page 8, lines 10-13 and at page 29, lines 1-3. The predefined tolerance is judgmental according to the user and should not be specified in the specification. The amendment of claims 32 and 41 is not believed necessary. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 32 and 41 is requested.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102 (e):

A. Claims 1-3, 5-29, 32-37, 39, 41 and 43-45 include features not disclosed in Jonsson and over overcome the rejection under 35 USC 102 (e), as follows:

Paragraph 1 – Claim 1:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 4 and 5 describes the subject matter of claim 1. Paragraphs 4 and 5 describe Bluetooth SDP protocol in sending requests and manual selection of answers to requests. Jonsson fails to disclose or suggest (i) personal profile generation and management in a short-range wireless terminal for sharing profiles in a short range wireless communication network; (ii) storing personal profiles in SDP records, and (iii) performing second level matching of profiles for providing detailed private information to an inquiring

device, as discussed in the previous consideration of Jonsson. The rejection of claim 1 is without support in the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102 (e) based on Jonsson and allowance thereof are requested.

Paragraph 2 – Claim 2:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 3 describes the subject matter of claim 3. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and further describes claim 1. Claim is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 1.

Paragraph 3 – Claim 3:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 3 describes the subject matter of claim 3. Paragraph 3 describes Bluetooth protocol. In contrast, claim 3 describes accessing a user's personal profile in a short-range wireless persona l. Jonsson discloses service profiles which do not equate to personal profiles, described in the specification at page 5, lines 22-23. The rejection of claim 3 is without support in the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 3 are requested.

Paragraph 4 – Claim 5:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 30 describes the subject matter of claim 5. Paragraph 30 describes an exemplary frequency hop synchronization packet. The packet does not describe the contents of a personal profile set forth in claim 5. The rejection of claim 5 is without support in the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 5 are requested.

Paragraph 5 – Claim 6:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 45 describes the subject matter of claim 6. Paragraph 45 describes service profiles changes to candidate lists. Paragraph 45 does not describe the bit masks in the personal profile described by applicant in Figure 3A. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 6. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 6 are requested

Paragraph 6 – Claim 7:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 4 describes the subject matter of claim 6. Paragraph 4 describes the SDP requests for service profiles which do not equate to personal profiles. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 7. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 7 are requested.

Paragraph 7 – Claim 8:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 3 describes the subject matter of claim 8 Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 3 describing filtering of messages. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 8. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 8 are requested.

Paragraph 8 – Claim 9:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 5 describes the subject matter of claim 6. Paragraph 5 describes manually selecting answers to a SDP request for service profiles. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 5 related editing a personal profile. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 9. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 9 are requested.

Paragraph 9 – Claim 10:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 21 describes the subject matter of claim 10. Paragraph 21 describes a Bluetooth piconet. Applicants can find no disclosure describing storing personal profiles at a centralized database and editing the profiles on a computer coupled to the database. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 10. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 10 are requested.

Paragraph 10 – Claim 11:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 4, 7, 19, 35 and 36 describe the subject matter of claim 11. The cited Paragraphs describe matching service profiles. There is no disclosure in the cited Paragraphs related to personal profiles or the database for storing the personal profiles. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 11. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 11 are requested.

Paragraph 11 – Claim 12:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 4, 7, 19, 35 and 36 describes the subject matter of claim 12. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited Paragraphs of writing generic information into the phone book section of a database. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 12. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 12 are requested.

Paragraph 12 – Claim 13:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 4, 7, 19, 35 and 36 describes the subject matter of claim 13. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited Paragraphs of writing detailed personal information into a detailed data section of a

database. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 13. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 13 are requested.

Paragraph 13 – Claim 14:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 30 describes the subject matter of claim 14. Paragraph 30 describes an exemplary frequency hop synchronization packet whereas applicants describe a SDP record including a standardized format for storing personal profiles. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 14. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 14 are requested

Paragraph 14 – Claim 15:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 34-36 describes the subject matter of claim 15. Paragraphs 34-36 describe maintaining device lists as shown in the process of Figure 7. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited Paragraphs related to linking a response message to a database for an object exchange (OBEX) for additional user defined information. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 15. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 15 are requested.

Paragraph 15 – Claim 16:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 36 describes the subject matter of claim 16. Paragraph 36 describes building a candidate list. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 36 or else where in the disclosure related to sending user information encoded in a vCard. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 16. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 16 are requested.

Paragraph 16 – Claim 17:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 36 describes the subject matter of claim 17. Paragraph 36 describes building a candidate list. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 36 or else where in the disclosure related to sending user information encoded in XML markup language. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 17. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 17 are requested.

Paragraph 17 – Claim 18:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 36 describes the subject matter of claim 18. Paragraph 36 describes building a candidate list. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 36 or else where in the disclosure related to transferring personal profile information to an inquiring terminal via a pull model. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 18. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 18 are requested.

Paragraph 18 – Claim 19:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 36 describes the subject matter of claim 19. Paragraph 36 describes building a candidate list. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 36 or else where in the disclosure related to transferring personal profile information to an inquiring terminal via a push model. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 19. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 19 are requested.

Paragraph 19 – Claim 20:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 36 describes the subject matter of claim 20. Paragraph 36 describes building a candidate list. Applicants can

find no disclosure in Paragraph 36 or else where in the disclosure related to transferring personal profile information to an inquiring terminal via a push model without authentication or encryption. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 20. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 20 are requested.

Paragraph 20 – Claim 21:

The Examiner contends Jonsson use of Bluetooth allows for the option of authentication, and describes the subject matter of claim 21. The Examiner has not identified in Jonsson or Bluetooth wherein detailed private information in a user's personal profile is protected by authentication and encryption. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 21. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 21 are requested.

Paragraph 21 – Claim 22:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 3 describes the subject matter of claim 22: Paragraph 3 describes an initiator discovering other Bluetooth devices and identifying services. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 3 related to encrypting private information to an inquiring device. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 22. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 22 are requested.

Paragraph 22 – Claim 23:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 36 describes the subject matter of claim 23. Paragraph 36 relates to building candidate lists. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 36 related to transferring general information to a user's personal profile in a pull model without encryption or authentication. The cited art

fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 23. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 23 are requested.

Paragraph 23 – Claim 24:

The Examiner contends Bluetooth allows authentication which describes the subject matter of claim 24. Claim 24 depends from claim 23 and is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 23.

Paragraph 24 – Claim 25:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 3 describes the subject matter of claim 25. Paragraph 3 describes an initiator discovering other Bluetooth devices and identifying services. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 3 related to encrypting private information in a user's profile for transmission to an inquiring device. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 25. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 25 are requested.

Paragraph 25 – Claim 26:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 25 describes the subject matter of claim 26. Paragraph 25 describes the BD_ADDR and AM_ADDR of a Bluetooth device. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited Paragraph related to a user wireless terminal and an inquiring wireless terminal registering with a server, as recited in claim 26. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 26. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 26 are requested.

Paragraph 26 – Claim 27:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 36-38 describes the subject matter of claim 27. Paragraphs 36-38 describe building candidate lists, an

unordered list and an ordered list. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited paragraphs related to a server providing match making services for the wireless devices. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 27. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 27 are requested.

Paragraph 27 – Claim 28:

Claim 28 depends from claim 27 and is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 27.

Paragraph 28 – Claim 29:

The Examiner contends Jonsson discloses Bluetooth which inherently discloses authentication the subject matter of claim 29. Applicant can find no disclosure in Jonsson or Bluetooth describing or suggesting registered users linking to a server for a PIN enabling authentication. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 29. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 29 are requested

Paragraph 29 – Claim 32:

The Examiner contends Paragraphs 36-38 describe the claimed subject matter. Paragraphs 36-38 describe building candidate lists, an unordered list and an ordered list. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited paragraphs related to matching service profiles within a tolerance. In any case, Claim 32 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 1

Paragraph 30 – Claims 33 and 45:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 3-5, 21, 24, 25 and 28-38 describe the subject matter of claims 33 and 45. For reasons discussed in connection with the consideration of claim 1, the cited Paragraphs do not describe

or suggest “performing second level matching of profiles for providing detailed private information to an inquiring device”, as recited in claims 33 and 45. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claims 33 and 45. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 33 and 45 are requested.

Paragraph 31 – Claim 34:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 21 discloses the subject matter of claim 34. Paragraph 21 describes a piconet. Claim 34 describes storing profile records in a database. Applicant can find no disclosure in Paragraph 3 related to storing profile records in a database. In any case, claim 34 depends from claim 33 and is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 33 or 45.

Paragraph 32 – Claim 35:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraph 3 discloses the subject matter of claim 35. Paragraph 3 describes an initiator discovering other Bluetooth devices and identifying services. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 3 related to personalization apparatus setting the terminal in a state to permit access by other terminals in a transaction. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 35. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 35 are requested.

Paragraph 33 – Claim 36:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 3-5 describe the subject matter of claim 36. Paragraphs 3-5 describe Bluetooth operation for imitating devices to locate services from other wireless terminals. Claim 36 depends from claim 33 and is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 33.

Paragraph 34 – Claim 37:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 21 describes the subject matter of claim 37. Paragraph 21 describes a piconet. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited Paragraph related to storing profiles in a remote storing apparatus. The cited art fails to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 37. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 37 are requested.

Paragraph 35– Claim 39:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 4 describes the subject matter of claim 39. Claim 39 depends from claim 45 and is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 45.

Paragraph 36 – Claim 41:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 36-38 describes the subject matter of claim 41.

Paragraph 37 – Claim 43:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 36-38 describes the subject matter of claim 43. Claim 43 depends from claim 45 and is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 45.

Paragraph 38 – Claim 44:

The Examiner contends Jonsson at Paragraphs 30 describes the subject matter of claim 44. Paragraph 30 discloses a frequency hop synchronization packet. Claim 44 depends from claim 45 and is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 45.

III. PATENTABILITY SUPPORT FOR NEW CLAIMS 46-48

New claims 46 – 49 describe two devices exchanging SDP records containing profiles of general information and detailed information. When a close match occurs between the general information profiles of the two devices, then the more personal profiles can be exchanged. The cited art does not disclose such functionality where certain information is exchangeable only after determining that there is matching between other portions of the SDP record.

IV. BLUETOOTH SPECIFICATION REVIEW:

Applicants have reviewed the specification with respect to the Bluetooth Specification, and have not identified any inconsistencies between the specification and the Bluetooth Specification. If the Examiner is aware of any inconsistency, please advise the inconsistency for our review and correction, if appropriate.

CONCLUSION

Having amended claims 1, 8, 33 and 45 to further define and distinguish the claimed subject matter from the cited art, and supported the patentability of New Claims 46-49; applicants request entry of the amendment; withdrawal of the rejection; allowance of the claims, and passage to issue of the case.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4064. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4064. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: September 13, 2006 By:

Joseph C. Redmond, Jr.

Joseph C. Redmond, Jr.

Registration No. 18,753

(202) 857-7887

Telephone

(202) 857-7929

Facsimile

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101